

To: Jackson, Ryan[jackson.ryan@epa.gov]; Dravis, Samantha[dravis.samantha@epa.gov]; Yamada, Richard (Yujiro)[yamada.richard@epa.gov]; Beck, Nancy[Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]; Gunasekara, Mandy[Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov]
Cc: Wilcox, Jahan[wilcox.jahan@epa.gov]; Feeley, Drew (Robert)[Feeley.Drew@epa.gov]; Bolen, Brittany[bolen.brittany@epa.gov]; Ferguson, Lincoln[ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov]
From: Bowman, Liz
Sent: Tue 11/7/2017 10:03:21 PM
Subject: FW: touching base on our story

I want to give you all a heads-up that this Washington Post article will be running in tomorrow's paper (potentially on the front page). I am told that this will be about what is highlighted below in the original inquiry – that we are going back and reassessing the science done by the Agency in the past. It will also mention his calls for Red/Blue. I will send it around when it's available. Please call me if you have questions 202-309-3416

From: Bowman, Liz
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Eilperin, Juliet <Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com>; Brady Dennis (brady.dennis@washpost.com) <brady.dennis@washpost.com>
Subject: Re: touching base on our story

OFF THE RECORD: Below, please find a quote that I would really like to include, to address the premise of the article ... the additional background on chloroprene is more for background so you all understand the issue, but you can quote from all these as well... I am still checking on the glider kits testing, so I might need to get back to you. Also, the chlorpyrifos is a complicated issue that has been incorrectly reported by a lot of outlets, so if you need more information, please let me know. I don't want to overcomplicate it, as it doesn't seem to be the focus of your article, but I am happy to provide additional details if you feel it's needed. Please just remember that the Administrator never met with Dow's CEO and AP ultimately corrected that article claiming he did from an outdated schedule they received via FOIA (they were scheduled to meet, they didn't end up meeting). Thank you – Liz

“EPA reviews all comments, research and data submitted to the Agency, as part of understanding the issue, so that the Agency can make informed decisions.” – EPA Spokesperson Liz Bowman

On TCE: We are currently evaluating the request for reconsideration that was received under the Information Quality Act.

On Gliders: The Tennessee Tech study is part of information submitted to EPA that is pertinent to the Agency's approach to gliders.

-

On Chloroprene at the Louisiana plant: The Agency has received a formal Information Quality Correction Request regarding the IRIS assessment of chloroprene. This matter is currently under review. As such, we will not comment on the IRIS value at this time.

Additional background:

Clean Air Act section 112 lays out a schedule that requires both a risk and a technology review within eight years of issuance of a MACT standard. The law requires a technology review every eight years thereafter.

As part of Denka's Administrative Order of Consent with LDEQ, the company agreed to install control technologies to reduce emissions of chloroprene at the facility. Once these control devices are in place, EPA will be closely evaluating the emissions and collecting data that would inform a technology review of this source category.

Our primary objective is to reduce emissions in the near term. Installing control technologies will meet this objective faster than the regulatory timeframe.

<https://www.epa.gov/quality/epa-information-quality-guidelines-requests-correction-and-requests-reconsideration>; <https://www.epa.gov/la/laplace-louisiana-background-information>

On Chlorpyrifos: USDA had scientific concerns with studies used by activists to call for a ban on the pesticide chlorpyrifos (see attached letter) – concerns raised by the Obama Administration USDA. No decision on the 2007 petition was made throughout the entire Obama Administration. Administrator Pruitt denied the petition based on the lack of time, divergent views from the previous administration and because FIFRA pesticide reviews are more transparent than a petition serving as a back door 'sue and settle' approach.

From: Eilperin, Juliet [<mailto:Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com>]

Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 1:40 PM

To: Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto: Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)>; Dennis, Brady <Brady.Dennis@washpost.com>

Subject: touching base on our story

Dear Liz,

Hey there, I thought I'd just summarize where we stand on our story, which is still being edited. The overall theme of the story is how, Administrator Pruitt's tenure, EPA is taking a second look at how the agency has conducted analyses in the past (primarily scientific ones, including on air pollutants and chemicals). Broadly speaking, agency officials have shown a willingness to listen to concerns industry has raised about some of these studies, and look at analyses that companies and trade groups have sponsored themselves. In that context, we are looking at the glider rule, the chlorpyrifos decision and the ongoing regulation of chloroprene's sole manufacturer in the US. (We may touch on a couple of other things, but only in passing.) We are drawing on comments the Administrator made during his confirmation hearing on science, and we are also quoting Science Committee Chairman Lamar Smith on this topic, as well as various other voices.

We will touch on the upcoming appointments to scientific advisory boards, and issues like the propose to run a "red-team/blue team" exercise on climate, but that's not a major focus of the piece.

I think that covers it, and if you get further word on chloroprene, let me know. Also, there's one minor detail that I have learned that I just thought I'd run by you: my understanding is that EPA's staff is in the process of running its own emissions tests on a glider kit at an agency facility, and those tests are not completed. I don't need confirmation of this, but I thought I'd share it in case you want to run it past the appropriate EPA division. But since that's just extra work for you, I'd leave it to your discretion.

I think that's all on this story—if you have any questions (or if Brady wants to chime in, since we are working in different places today), feel free to follow up.

Also, do you think there will be some advance briefing on the scientific advisory appointments next week, if that is when they are actually announced?

Thanks, Juliet

Juliet Eilperin

Senior National Affairs Correspondent

Washington Post

Juliet.eilperin@washpost.com

(O) 202-334-7774

(C) 202-302-3663

@eilperin